15. In response to Paragraph 15 of Plaintiffs' Complaint, Defendant denies that Central Florida Toyota, or any Toyota-authorized dealership, is an agent of TMS and denies that TMS exercised control over Central Florida Toyota or any other Toyota authorized dealership. Further answering, TMS denies that it exercised control over Central Florida Toyota in the manner described in (a) through (g) of Paragraph 15 of Plaintiffs' Complaint. The relationships between Toyota authorized dealerships and TMS are governed by an agreement, which is a written document that speaks for itself. TMS denies that it was the manufacturer of Plaintiffs' vehicle. Further answering, the remaining allegations set forth in Paragraph 15 of Plaintiffs' Complaint state legal conclusions to which no response is required. To the extent a response is deemed to be required, Defendant is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations, and therefore denies the same.

16. Defendant denies each and every allegation set forth in Paragraph 16 of Plaintiffs' Complaint.

17. In response to Paragraph 17 of Plaintiffs' Complaint, TMS admits that, upon information and belief, Central Florida Toyota used a Toyota logo in advertising and on documents, but denies that Central Florida Toyota was an agent or acted on behalf of TMS. Defendant is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations set forth in Paragraph 17 of Plaintiffs' Complaint, and therefore denies the same. TMS denies that it was the manufacturer of Plaintiffs' vehicle.

18. Defendant denies each and every allegation set forth in Paragraph 18 of Plaintiffs' Complaint. TMS denies that it was the manufacturer of Plaintiffs' vehicle.

TOY-TQ002-06-3D-00000192